

not inspected by HUD prior to start of construction. With improvements in local zoning and inspection laws, this special limitation is outdated, and places an unnecessary inspection burden on HUD staff. FHA insurance of new homes continues to fall, in part because of this restriction. Ten years ago, when FHA's total business was roughly one-third of today's volume, its new construction business was approximately 40 percent higher than it is today. I believe that elimination of this unnecessary limitation would make FHA more competitive in this area. Again, this provision was adopted in committee by voice vote and included in H.R. 3838 last year.

Finally, section 7 of my bill would eliminate the need for FHA approval of condominium projects, when any such project has already been approved by a government sponsored enterprise [GSE]. Requiring FHA approval in this case is redundant, and is the type of bureaucratic excess that we are seeking to undo.

In conclusion, as we move to consideration of proposals dealing with FHA and other Federal housing programs, let's make sensible decisions which preserve opportunities for all Americans. My approach is simple: don't eliminate FHA—modernize it. I believe the FHA Modernization and Efficiency Act is the way to do this, and would welcome cosponsors for this important legislation.

SALUTING ROBERT AND ERIC
SCHULTZ

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of all of our colleagues a courageous act of bravery on the part of two of my constituents, who serve as an inspiration to all of us.

Robert W. Schultz of New City, NY, and his 24-year old son Eric were vacationing at Saranac Lake in New York's Adirondack Mountains last May when they witnessed the capsizing of a canoe on the lake which was occupied by a father and son.

Both Robert and Eric dove into the freezing waters of the lake to rescue the two unfortunate canoeists. Eric managed to get the son to an island, where he administered first aid in the manner which he learned in the Boy Scouts, and performed other procedures which brought the young man back to consciousness. In the meantime, Bob was able to lead the father to another location on shore, where by utilizing the survival skills he had learned as a Boy Scout, reversed the first stages of hypothermia which had begun to set in, and stabilized the gentleman's condition until help arrived. Both Bob and Eric remained calm and collected throughout this emergency situation, and their actions resulted in saving the lives of both father and son.

Because of their heroism and their expertise, both Robert and Eric are being presented the Boy Scouts of America Lifesaving Award, perhaps the most prestigious honor bestowed by the Boy Scouts. Bob and Eric had both achieved the rank of Eagle Scout, and there is no doubt that the skills they had obtained as a part of their Boy Scout training directly led to the saving of both of these lives.

Mr. Speaker, in today's cynical society, many people question the relevance of the Boy Scouts of America to today's society. Let us point to Bob and Eric Schultz as a shining example of the worthiness of the Boy Scout movement—an organization which warrants the support of all of us. To those cynical naysayers, let us remind them too that the skills, the leadership, and the good citizenship which are the foundation of Scouting benefit our Nation as a whole.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF FREEDOM FROM GOVERNMENT COMPETITION POLICY

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, January 15, 1995, will mark a historic anniversary in the history of our Nation and one which could not occur at a more appropriate time.

It was on January 15, 1955, that President Dwight Eisenhower issued a policy that:

The Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels.

That policy is still on the books today in Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76. However, this policy has been regularly avoided during the past 40 years. The Congressional Budget Office reported in 1987 that some 1.4 million Federal employees are engaged in occupations that are commercial in nature.

The Grace Commission recommended contracting out and estimated that \$4.6 billion a year could be saved by using private contractors to perform the commercial activities currently accomplished in-house by Federal employees. Even this administration's National Performance Review recommended that A-76 be strengthened and enforced.

The issue of government competition with the private sector has become so pervasive that the most recent White House Conference on Small Business adopted as one of its leading planks:

Government at all levels has failed to protect small business from damaging levels of unfair competition. At the federal, state and local levels, therefore, laws, regulations and policies should . . . prohibit direct, government created competition in which government organizations perform commercial services . . . New laws at all levels, particularly at the federal level, should require strict government reliance on the private sector for performance of commercial-type functions. When cost comparisons are necessary to accomplish conversion to private sector performance, laws must include provision for fair and equal cost comparisons. Funds controlled by a government entity must not be used to establish or conduct a commercial activity on U.S. property.

The issue is again at the top of the agenda of America's small business owners, having been adopted as a plank in several of the State meetings leading to the 1995 White House Conference on Small Business that will convene in Washington, DC, in June.

During the 102d and 103d Congress, I introduced legislation known as the Freedom from

Government Competition Act. This bill would provide a legislative mandate for implementation of the 1955 Eisenhower policy. It would require OMB to conduct an inventory of commercial activities performed by Federal agencies using Government employees and establish a process for contracting those activities to the private sector over a 5-year period.

During the course of my research on this matter, I have become aware of a particularly glaring example of the insidious nature of Government intrusion into an area that rightfully should be performed by the private sector. That is the field of surveying and mapping.

The Federal Government annually spends approximately \$1 billion on surveying and activities, but in fiscal year 1993 only \$69 million or 6.9 percent was contracted to the private sector while there are some 6,000 surveying firms and 250 mapping firms in the United States. You can go into any county seat in Tennessee or any other town in the Nation and you will find a private professional surveyor's firm within a 5-minute walk of the courthouse ready, willing, and able to do this work.

Not only do Federal agencies fail to contract a meaningful amount of their surveying and mapping requirements, but they market their services to other Federal agencies and to State, local, and foreign governments, in direct and unfair competition with the private sector. It just doesn't make sense for the U.S. Government to have this capability when it is available from the private sector. I am convinced the more than 99 percent of the surveying and mapping firms that are indeed small business, as well as the larger firms, can save tax dollars and help us reduce the Federal deficit by working under contract with Federal agencies, and that the surveying and mapping firms in Tennessee and the other States can do as good if not better job of surveying and mapping our land than the Government.

The surveying and mapping community is a perfect example of overzealous Government growth in an activity that can and should be performed by the private sector. The old chain and transit methods of surveying have been replaced by Global Positioning System [GPS] satellite receivers, analytical computer mapping systems, and other technologies. It is frustrating to small business men and women that their markets, both domestic and foreign, are limited by the predatory activities of Federal agencies and that their tax dollars are supporting purchases of this same equipment by these agencies.

While there has been considerable discussion of privatization, an end to State-dominated economies in favor of market oriented economies, individual initiative, and other virtues that led Eastern Europe to discard socialism in favor of capitalism, Washington has not practiced here at home what we are preaching in fledgling democratic nations. When a Government agency competes with private firms it stifles growth in private industry by dominating certain markets; diverts needed personnel, particularly in technical occupations, from private sector employment; thwarts efforts by U.S. firms to export their services; and erodes the tax base by securing work that would otherwise be accomplished by tax paying entities.

Not only have the advantages of privatization and private sector utilization been recognized on the international scene, but these